REMARKS

Applicants have received an Office Action dated April 15, 2004 (Paper No. 8), which contains a requirement to restrict the present Application.

In response to the restriction requirement, Applicants provisionally elect to prosecute the Group I claims, namely Claims 1 to 7, 14 and 17. It is respectfully requested that new Claims 20 and 21, which depend from elected Claim 1, also be examined in the present application. Further discussion of Claims 20 and 21 is provided below.

The restriction requirement is traversed.

The Office Action identifies the following three groups, and corresponding classifications:

Group I:	Claims 1 to 7, 14 and 17, allegedly drawn to a method of extracting key frames from a video sequence, in class 348, subclass 699;
Group II:	Claims 8 to 11, 15 and 18, allegedly drawn to a method of generating a representation of a video sequence, in class 375, subclass 240.24; and
Group III:	Claims 12, 13, 16 and 19, allegedly drawn to a method of extracting key frames from one or more video clips, in class 375, subclass 240.16.

For the reasons presented herein, Applicants respectfully submit that the restriction requirement is improper and therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement, and the concurrent examination of all currently-pending claims of Groups I, II and III.

An application may be properly required to be restricted to one of two or more claimed inventions only if: 1) the inventions are able to support separate patents and

they are either independent or distinct, and 2) the search and examination of an entire application would place a serious burden on the Examiner. MPEP § 803. Both of these criteria must be met for the requirement to be proper. If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the restriction is not considered to be proper, and the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

As indicated above, the Office Action alleges that the claims of Groups II and III belong to class 375, subclasses 240.24 and 240.16, respectively. Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of the present application belong in a single class; to wit, Class 348, subclass 699, because they are all directed to extracting key frames from video data (e.g., a video sequence or video clip), which has motion vectors used in selecting the key frames. Class 348 deals with generating, processing, transmitting or transiently display a sequence of images, which are intended to portray motion. Subclass 699, entitled "Motion Vector Generation", includes subject matter for determining the direction and magnitude of displacement of elements in the image.

In contrast, class 375 deals with communication systems which include transmitting an intelligence bearing signal from one point to another in the form of discrete variations in some parameter of the electrical or electromagnetic signal. Applicants submit that the subject matter of the claims of the present invention is directed to extracting key frames selected based on motion vectors of video data, and not particularly directed to the

feature of transmitting a signal from one point to another, as in Class 375.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claims of Groups II and III were improperly classified, and that all claims of Groups I, II and III should be classified in Class 348, subclass 699. In this regard, it is noted that the description of Groups I and III provided by the Office Action, and reproduced above, differ only in the use of the phrases "video sequence" in Group I and "one or more video clips" in Group III.

New Claim 20 is directed to steps used in the step of generating the global motion vectors from motion vectors in the compressed video data recited in Claim 1.

More particularly, new Claim 20, which depends from Claim 1, is directed to the step of generating global motion vectors, wherein compressed video data of the video sequence has motion vectors which are block motion vectors, wherein the compressed video data is decompressed to obtain the block motion vectors, the block motion vectors are converted to forward block motion vectors, and the global motion signals are generated based on the forward block motion vectors. It is noted that similar steps are also recited in Group II and III claims, such as Claims 8 and 12.

New Claim 21, which is dependent on new Claim 20, has the feature that the compressed video data is MPEG compressed video data.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that, since the claims of Groups I, II and III are all directed to the field of art concerning extraction of key frames from video data (e.g., a video sequence or video clip), the video data having motion vectors used in selecting the key frames, the search and examination of all pending claims of Groups I, II and III can be made without serious burden, and therefore restriction is believed to be

improper. MPEP § 803. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that concurrent search and examination of all claims of Groups I, II and III can be made without serious burden.

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the restriction requirement is improper and therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement, and the concurrent examination of all currently-pending claims of Groups I, II and III.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 39,000

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 81236v1